UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/052,896 | 01/15/2002 | Eric Coates | 13838/002001 / FGN/43011 | 9089 |

20985 7590 03/11/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LU, KUEN S | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2167 | |

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/052,896 | COATES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kuen S Lu | 2167 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 November 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## *DETAILED ACTION*

### *Response to Amendments*

**1.** The Action is responsive to the Applicant's Amendments, filed on November 5, 2004.

**2.** Filed on May 15, 2002, the Applicant's claim for foreign priority date as January 16, 2001 is noted and confirmed, under conditions of 35 U.S.C. ξ 119 (a) – (d).

**3.** The Applicant's amendments made to the claims 41-43 is noted. Further, the applicant's amendments made to the claims 11, 22 and 36, filed on November 5, 2004, new issue raised when the claim pre-ample "updating information relating to an entry in a database having a plurality of data items related to data subjects, the information including an indication of when the data related to a given data subject was last verified as correct by that data subject" became a new limitation of the claim. The new issue, amended, new and original claims are addressed accordingly in the Office Action for non-Final Rejection as shown next.

**4.** As for the Applicant's Remarks on claim rejections, filed on November 5, 2004, has been fully considered by the Examiner, please see discussion in the section ***Response to Arguments***, following the Office Action for non-Final Rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

**5.** The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**6.** Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 16-18, 20-23, 28-29, 32, 34-38 and 41-43 are rejected are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by OraAdm (Oracle7™ Server Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, 1996, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm").

As per Claims 1, 12 and 23, OraAdm further teaches the following:
"attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items, the wrapper including consensus related information" (See Pages 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's special auditing records include reason for data change as a consensus related information attached to the data items employee name, job and salary is equivalent to Applicant's attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items, the wrapper including consensus related information); and
"passing the data items to a user for viewing" (See Page 21-2 wherein OraAdm's audit records are generated and reported to user and also note that passing data to a user for viewing is a fundamental feature of a database system is equivalent to Applicant's passing the data items to a user for viewing).

As per Claims 5, 16 and 28, OraAdm further teaches "automatically updating the indication of when the data was last correct when the user to whom the data item relates views the data item" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the

data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's automatically updating the indication of when the data was last correct when the user to whom the data item relates views the data item).

As per Claims 6, 17 and 29, OraAdm further teaches "an indication of when and by whom the data item was changed" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's an indication of when and by whom the data item was changed).

As per Claims 7, 18 and 32, OraAdm further teaches "comprising the steps of updating an audit log when the data item or any data in the wrapper relating to the data

item is changed" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's comprising the steps of updating an audit log when the data item or any data in the wrapper relating to the data item is changed).

As per Claims 9 and 20, OraAdm further teaches "a flag is set for each user indicating whether they have accepted a current rule set governing access to the database, and access to the database is denied if the rule set is not accepted" (See Page 18-4 wherein OraAdm's user authorization to access a database is controlled by password when access accepted or denied is governed by the correct password and authorized user login entered is equivalent to Applicant's a flag is set for each user indicating whether they have accepted a current rule set governing access to the database, and access to the database is denied if the rule set is not accepted).

As per Claims 10, 21 and 35, OraAdm further teaches "automatically notifying an administrator if a user makes a change to a data item related to the user" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option,

including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's automatically notifying an administrator if a user makes a change to a data item related to the user).

As per Claims 11, 22 and 36, OraAdm teaches the following:
"updating information relating to an entry in a database having a plurality of data items related to data subjects, the information including an indication of when the data related to a given data subject was last verified as correct by that data subject" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis is equivalent to Applicant's updating information relating to an entry in a database having a plurality of data items related to data subjects, the information including an indication of when the data related to a given data subject was last verified as correct by that data subject); and

"updating the information automatically when the data subject to whom the data item relates views the data item" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's updating the information automatically when the data subject to whom the data item relates views the data item).

As per Claim 34, OraAdm further teaches "the users comprise a data controller and a plurality of data subjects" (See Pages 20-2 to 20-7 wherein OraAdm's various database privileges are assigned to users for performing on, controlling and protecting database objects is equivalent to Applicant's the users comprise a data controller and a plurality of data subjects).

As per Claims 37 and 38, OraAdm further teaches the following:
"attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items, the wrapper including consensus related information" (See Pages 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's special auditing records include reason for data change as a consensus related information attached to the data items employee name, job and salary is equivalent to Applicant's

attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items, the wrapper including consensus related information);

"passing the data items to a user for viewing" (See Page 21-2 wherein OraAdm's audit records are generated and reported to user and also note that passing data to a user for viewing is a fundamental feature of a database system is equivalent to Applicant's passing the data items to a user for viewing);

"the wrapper includes an indication of when the data was last correct" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis is equivalent to Applicant's the wrapper includes an indication of when the data was last correct); and

"automatically updating the indication of when the data was last correct when the user to whom the data item relates views the data item" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the

database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's updating the information automatically when the data subject to whom the data item relates views the data item); "the wrapper including consensus related information, the information including an indication of when the data related to a given data subject was last verified as correct by that data subject, comprising instructions for causing a computer to update the information automatically when the data subject to whom the data item relates views the data item" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's the wrapper including consensus related information, the information including an indication of when the data related to a given data subject was last verified as correct by that data subject, comprising instructions for causing a computer to update the information automatically when the data subject to whom the data item relates views the data item).

As per claims 41-43, OraAdm teaches "the wrapper including consensus related information, the information including an indication of when the data related to a given data subject was last verified as correct by that data subject, comprising instructions for

causing a computer to update the information automatically when the data subject to whom the data item relates views the data item" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's special auditing records include reason for data change as a consensus related information, and wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's automatically updating the indication of when the data was last correct when the user to whom the data item relates views the data item).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

**7.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained although the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**8.** Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAdm (Oracle7™ Server Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, 1996, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm") as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Frymier et al. (U.S. Patent 5,604,487, hereafter "Frymier").

As per claims 8 and 19, OraAdm teaches attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items as previously described in claim 1 rejection.

OraAdm does not specifically teach the wrapper "calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database", although OraAdm implements checksum for data blocks at Page 9-11.

Frymier teaches "calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication is equivalent to Applicant's calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Frymier's teaching with OraAdm reference because both references teaches implementing data checksum to enhance data accuracy and the combined reference would have further improved accuracy of data such that integrity of data could have been further guaranteed when the data is received.

Frymier further teaches "comparing the calculated value with the checksum in the wrapper" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to

end checksum for the data communication and receiver calculates checksum for verifying correctness of sender's checksum is equivalent to Applicant's comparing the calculated value with the checksum in the wrapper); and

"forwarding the data item to the user only if the calculated checksum agrees with the checksum in the wrapper" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication and the checksum data was provided to the recipient in advance suggests data item is forwarded only when the calculated checksum agreed is equivalent to Applicant's forwarding the data item to the user only if the calculated checksum agrees with the checksum in the wrapper).

**9.** Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAdm (Oracle7™ Server Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, 1996, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm") and in view of Choy (U.S. Patent 6,581,060) as applied to claims 23-25 above, and further in view of Frymier et al. (U.S. Patent 5,604,487, hereafter "Frymier").

As per claim 30, the combined Choy-OraAdm reference teaches database located at a database server and store located at a consensus server as previously described in claim 24 rejection.

The combined Choy-OraAdm reference does not specifically teach the wrapper "calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database", although OraAdm implements checksum for data blocks at Page 9-11.

Frymier teaches "calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication is equivalent to Applicant's calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Frymier's teaching with the combined Choy-OraAdm reference because the references teaches implementing data checksum to enhance data accuracy and the further combined reference would have further improved accuracy of data such that integrity of data could have been further guaranteed when the data is received.

Frymier further teaches "comparing the calculated value with the checksum in the wrapper" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication and receiver calculates checksum for verifying correctness of sender's checksum is equivalent to Applicant's comparing the calculated value with the checksum in the wrapper); and

"forwarding the data item to the user only if the calculated checksum agrees with the checksum in the wrapper" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication and the checksum data was provided to the recipient in advance suggests data item is forwarded only when the calculated checksum agreed is equivalent to Applicant's forwarding the data item to the user only if the calculated checksum agrees with the checksum in the wrapper).

**10.** Claims 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAdm (Oracle7™ Server Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, 1996, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm") in view of Frymier et al. (U.S. Patent 5,604,487, hereafter "Frymier").

As per claims 39 and 40, OraAdm teaches the following:

"attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items, the wrapper including consensus related information" (See Pages 21-3, 21-11, 21-22 and 21-23 wherein OraAdm's audit trail utility sets up audit option, including the related person viewing the data, tracks information about database activities, including viewing data and records the tracked information into audit trail table(s). Further, special type auditing on data may be performed by using database triggers to store information on data value changes serving indication of data going from correct to incorrect on timely basis. Furthermore, the information is updated and preserved serially as records in the database without erasing the old is equivalent to Applicant's attaching a wrapper to at least some of the data items, the wrapper including consensus related information).

OraAdm does not specifically teach the wrapper "containing a checksum", although OraAdm implements checksum for data blocks at Page 9-11.

Frymier teaches "containing a checksum" (See Fig. 6B, element 129 and col. 19, lines 40-45 wherein Frymier's product data checksum data is contained in or included as part of the product acknowledgement is equivalent to Applicant's containing a checksum).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Frymier's teaching with OraAdm reference because both references teaches implementing data checksum to enhance data accuracy and the combined reference would have further improved accuracy of data such that integrity of data could have been further guaranteed when the data is received.

Frymier further teaches "calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication is equivalent to Applicant's calculating a value of the checksum when a data item is requested from the database);

"comparing the calculated value with the checksum in the wrapper" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication and receiver calculates checksum for verifying correctness of sender's checksum is equivalent to Applicant's comparing the calculated value with the checksum in the wrapper); and

"forwarding the data item to the user only if the calculated checksum agrees with the checksum in the wrapper" (See col. 5, lines 42-50 wherein Frymier's transfer protocol provides end to end checksum for the data communication and the checksum data was provided to the recipient in advance suggests data item is forwarded only when the calculated checksum agreed is equivalent to Applicant's forwarding the data item to the user only if the calculated checksum agrees with the checksum in the wrapper).

**11.** Claims 2-4, 13-15, 24-27, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAdm (Oracle7™ Server Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, 1996, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm") and in view of Choy (U.S. Patent 6,581,060).

As per Claims 2 and 13, OraAdm teaches attaching data to wrapper .

OraAdm does not specifically teach "wrapper includes an indication of whether the data items can be displayed to other users".

However, Choy teaches "wrapper includes an indication of whether the data items can be displayed to other users" at col. 2, lines 33-37 and col. 7, lines 46-48 where multiple rows of data can be bound to respective multiple access control rules, including the read authorization of data.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Choy's teaching with OraAdm reference because OraAdms provide database management system for access to users while Choy recognizes the need of users to access a database directly and without requiring to re-engineer RDBMS to account for extending access control, and the combined reference would have enabled applications directly access RDBMS for improving performance.

As per Claims 3, 14 and 26, Choy further teaches "the indication comprises a consent flag" at Fig. 2, element 40 and col. 5, lines 45-55 where ACL attribute can be evaluated to allow or disallow for serving as a consensus key.

As per Claims 4, 15 and 27, Choy further teaches "the consent flag has a first state in which the data item can be viewed by other users, a second state in which the data item cannot be viewed by other users" at Fig. 2, element 40 and col. 5, lines 45-55 where ACL attribute can be evaluated to allow or disallow for serving as a consensus key, and "a default state in which the data item can be viewed by other users only if it is not defined as sensitive data" at col. 5, lines 28-30, 36-38 and 51-55 by suggesting the functionality of ACL attribute (consisting of privilege, user and condition attributes) for access protection can be extended, including a default third state.

As per Claim 24, OraAdm teaches "database is located at a database server" at Page 1-18 where a database RDBMS is planned on a database server implemented on a hardware platform.

OraAdm does not specifically teach "store is located at a consensus server", although OraAdm teaches wrapping data item to wrapper in the form of auditing records as previously described in claim 23 rejections.

Choy teaches "store is located at a consensus server" at Fig. 5 wherein Choy's consensus information from various sources wrapped into an access authorization table and the data store for the table is equivalent to the Applicant's consensus server.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Choy's teaching with OraAdm reference by separating database server from the consensus server because the two references are

directed to data access control and validity and the combined reference would have separated database management server from application server. The separation of the servers would have provided flexibility of database and application maintenance. Further more, the separation would have provided scalability for system configuration.

As per Claim 25, Choy further teaches "a rules table for applying flag rules and consensus rules to data items and system users respectively" at Fig. 5, where access authorization table is the rules table whose condition, operation and ACL components are combined with user and user group components to provide flag rules and consensus rules to users and system users respectively.

As per Claim 31, OraAdm further teaches "a flag is set for each user indicating whether they have accepted a current rule set governing access to the database, and access to the database is denied if the rule set is not accepted" (See Page 18-4 wherein OraAdm's user authorization to access a database is controlled by password when access accepted or denied is governed by the correct password and authorized user login entered is equivalent to Applicant's a flag is set for each user indicating whether they have accepted a current rule set governing access to the database, and access to the database is denied if the rule set is not accepted).

As per Claim 33, the combined Choy-OraAdm reference suggests the teaching of "a web server for providing access to users across the Internet" (See OraAdm: Page 2-9

where database is globally accessible via network, and Choy: Fig. 1, element 18 where output devices include network).

***Response to Arguments***

**12.** The Applicants' arguments filed on November 5, 2004 have been fully considered, for the Examiner's response, please see discussion below.

At Pages 17-18, concerning claims 11, 22 and 36, the Applicant argued that the Oracle8 auto trail feature does not teach "updating the information automatically when the data, subject to whom the data item relates, view the data". Further, the Applicant argued that the Oracle8 regenerates data while the Application updates.

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully disagreed. By setting up audit options, audit trail utility tracks information about person on viewing audited data and records the information into audit trail table(s). Please note the information is continuously written into the table(s) every time the data is audited data. Based on this feature, the Examiner interprets the information regarding data is automatically updated serially, as taught by the Oracle8 reference.

As to the Applicants' other arguments filed on November 5, 2004 with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## ***Conclusions***

**14.** The prior art made of record

A. U.S. Patent 6,581,060

H. U.S. Patent 5,604,487

U. Oracle7™ Server Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, 1996, Oracle® Corporation.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

B. U.S. Publication 2002/0188774

C. U.S. Publication 2002/0042910

D. U.S. Patent 6,510,513

E. U.S. Publication 2001/0019614

F. U.S. Patent 6,578,037

G. U.S. Patent 6,654,745

**15.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 571-272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If at tempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-252-2100.

Kuen S. Lu
Patent Examiner

March 8, 2005

Luke Wassum

Primary Examiner

March 8, 2005